

## SUMMARY

### S.1 Project Synopsis

#### Project Description

The Peaceful Valley Ranch (PVR) project is a 181.31-acre property located in the community of Jamul, just north of the community of Dulzura, in the unincorporated area of San Diego County, California; refer to Figure 1-1. State Route 94 (SR-94/Campo Road) forms the property's western edge; a portion of the Daley Ranch property abuts the southern side; Melody Road forms a portion of the northern edge; and a mix of private properties border the remaining northern edge and eastern boundary; refer to Figure 1-2. Primary access to the site is from Peaceful Valley Ranch Road off SR-94. The property is located within the County of San Diego's Jamul-Dulzura Community Planning Area. The Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) for the property are 597-050-13, 597-060-02, 597-070-02 and 597-070-07.

The PVR project proposes the subdivision of the 181.31 acres for an estate residential development, equestrian uses and amenities, and public fire service facilities; refer to Figure 1-4. The current development plan includes a total of 57 lots consisting of:

- a) One estate residential lot of 4.0 acres for the existing ranch house (Lot 5);
- b) 46 new residential lots ranging in size from a minimum of two acres up to approximately 7.7 acres (Lots 1-4, 6-47);
- c) One 6.7-acre public equestrian facility lot (Lot 48);
- d) One 3.7-acre lot reserved for a new joint-use fire station and administrative offices of the San Diego Rural Fire Protection District (RFPD) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (Lot 49);
- e) One 3.7-acre open space lot for the protection of biological resources (Lot 50);
- f) One 28.9-acre private horse stable and polo training facilities/polo field lot (Lot 51); and,
- g) Six private roadway lots (Lots 52-57).

Public agricultural uses will consist of a public equestrian facility that is envisioned as a boarding and training facility for arena-type riding shows and events. The facility will include several barns to accommodate up to 30 horses, several small paddocks for horse turnouts, and an arena with jumps for training and horse show purposes. The facilities will also include an enclosed barn for feed storage; hot walker; bullpen; manure storage area; office area (approximately 200 square feet) and restrooms; caretaker residence; and parking area. Boarding and training activities will be available to the general public on a fee basis.

In addition, Lot 51 is proposed for a 28.9-acre private horse stable and polo training facility within the Peaceful Valley Ranch proposed development plan; refer to Figure 1-4. The facility will be privately owned and operated, for the main agribusiness purpose of acquiring thoroughbred horses that are unsuitable for racing. The facility is intended for the boarding and training of such horses for polo play and ultimately selling them to the polo enthusiast. The facility itself will be of the highest quality, befitting the image and nature of the polo sport business, and will include four barns to accommodate up to 48 polo ponies, paddocks for daily horse turnout, and a regulation size polo field (160 by 300 yards, plus run-on areas

with a training track surround). Additional facilities will include a bullpen; hot walkers; hay barn for feed storage; manure storage area; office area (approximately 200 square feet) and restrooms; caretaker residence; and a parking area. Those planned operations and uses include, among other activities, a limited number of anticipated polo events / matches, which events have been classified as “Outdoor Participant Sports and Recreation” under the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance. Such use types require a Major Use Permit within the A72 General Agricultural Zone designation for the property. This private agricultural use will be developed onsite as the Peaceful Valley Ranch Training Facility and Polo Field, envisioned as the premier polo horse breeding, boarding, and training facility in San Diego County.

### **Land Use and Zoning Designations**

The 181.31-acre site currently consists of two different plan designations and zoning regulations. In order to allow the proposed land use plan, a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and rezone are required to reclassify the eastern 152.46 acres of the site from an (18) Multiple Rural Use Plan General Plan designation (1 dwelling unit [du]/4, 8, 20 acres [ac]) with an A72(8 acre minimum lot size) General Agriculture zone to a (17) Estate Residential General Plan designation (1 du/2, 4 ac) with an A72(2 acre minimum lot size) General Agriculture zone. The proposed plan amendment and rezone will be consistent with the existing land use and zone designations on the western 28.85 acres as well as the surrounding community. Additionally, the (17) Estate Residential plan designation is consistent with the area’s Regional Category of Estate Developmental Area (EDA). The remaining western 28.85 acres are currently designated (17) Estate Residential and zoned consistent with the PVR development proposal.

### **Deletion of a Portion of SC 760 from Olive Vista Drive to SR-94**

The Peaceful Valley Ranch GPA proposes the deletion of a segment of a circulation element road from the Circulation Element of the County *General Plan*; refer to Figure 2.1-13. The road has not been constructed and its proposed future alignment is designated within the Circulation Element as SC 760. The segment of SC 760 proposed for deletion extends from Olive Vista Drive in the north to SR-94 in the south. Potential impacts associated with the redistribution of future traffic volumes within the regional roadway network were assessed in the GPA Report prepared for the proposed project; refer to Appendix H. Potential impacts relating to the elimination of access opportunities to properties along the SC 760 adopted corridor alignment were also assessed. Refer to Section 2.1.4 of this EIR for additional discussion.

### **Utilities and Public Services**

The project can be served by expanding the Otay Water District’s Regulatory 1296 Water Service Zone. An approximately 28.85-acre portion of the property, located adjacent to Campo Road, is already within the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), Otay Water District (OWD), and the Otay Water District Improvement District Number 9. This portion of the property is eligible for water service by paying meter capacity fees and constructing water system improvements. The remaining 152.46 acres of the project are within the boundaries of the OWD and have been conditionally annexed into the OWD Improvement District Number 9, but are not within the boundaries of the MWD or SDCWA. Prior to receiving water service from the Otay Water

District, this portion of the project will require annexation into the boundaries of MWD and SDCWA.

In addition to the 152.46-acre portion of the Peaceful Valley Ranch, an existing 8-acre residential “out-parcel,” surrounded on three sides by the Peaceful Valley Ranch property, is also proposed to be annexed. Thus, the total area to be annexed into the SDWCA and MWD is approximately 160 acres. The project proposes to utilize groundwater to support irrigation of the polo field.

The Rural Fire Protection District will provide fire service and the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department will provide police protection for the project. The project is within the Jamul-Dulzura Union School District and the Grossmont Union High School District boundaries for elementary and high school facilities.

### *Environmental Setting*

The property has historically been used for dry farming and, for the past five years, an organic farm operation. The organic farmer voluntarily ceased operations and abandoned the property in August 2004. There is no current plan to re-establish an organic farm use on the property. There is an existing ranch house on the property, planned to be retained as part of the development program. One of the two small caretaker houses is planned to be demolished (the one under the oak on the north side of the bridge over the creek). The other (the old Benson house) is planned to be converted into the polo field administration office.

All of the historic and currently existing water demands for the property are currently supplied by groundwater wells. There are a total of five existing wells on the PVR property; refer to Figure 1-6. One of these wells (PV-5) serves an 8-acre out-parcel, surrounded on three sides by the PVR property (Stoddard Property). Two of the four remaining wells (PV-1 and PV-4) are in active use, serving the existing residential, equine and agricultural uses. A third well (PV-2) is currently inactive, but is known to produce groundwater at significant rates. A fourth well (PV-3) is a hand-dug well currently not in use.

Primary land uses west and south of the site are designated as agricultural. Low-density residential uses are to the north and east. Parcels to the west of the subject property are designated (21) Specific Plan Area (0.35 du/ac) and are zoned S88 Specific Planning Area (includes Otay Ranch Village 16). Parcels to the northwest (including Proctor Valley Estates) are designated (1) Residential and are zoned RR1 Rural Residential (1 du/ac). Directly north, parcels are designated (17) Estate and are zoned A70-2 Limited Agriculture (1 du/2 ac). Parcels to the east are designated (18) Multiple Rural Use and are zoned RR.25 Rural Residential (1 du/4ac). Parcels to the east and southeast (Rancho Jamul Estates) are designated (18) Multiple Rural Use and are zoned RR.5 Rural Residential (1 du/2 ac). Directly south is dedicated open space on a portion of the Daley Ranch. Parcels to the southwest are designated (20) General Agriculture and zoned A72-8 General Agricultural (1 du/8 ac).

Topography onsite consists largely of rolling hills, with elevation gradually increasing from west to east. There are two small knolls on the western portion and a larger knoll on the south-central portion of the site. The eastern two-thirds of the property gently slopes up towards the east. The central and southern portions of the site slope up towards two peaks. The elevation on the site ranges from 828 to 1,108 feet above mean sea level. Average slope

onsite is approximately 14.3%, with approximately 15.5% of the site consisting of slopes 25% or greater. Soils on the site are Fallbrook, Ramona, Cienaba rocky course, Vista rocky course, Placentia sandy loams, and Tujunga sand.

An ephemeral drainage, portion of which support riparian vegetation, bisects the property from the north to the south, and a second intermittent drainage crosses the southeast corner. In addition to the streambeds, nine different vegetative communities, as well as disturbed and developed areas, have been identified on the project site. Dominant habitat types onsite are agriculture (1060 acres), Diegan coastal sage scrub (27.4 acres), disturbed coastal sage scrub (2.2 acres), and disturbed habitat (9.5 acres), which cover approximately 81 percent of the property. Other sensitive habitat types are Coast live oak woodland (0.9 acres), riparian woodland (0.4 acres), southern mixed chaparral (3.1 acres), non-native grassland (25.0 acres), eucalyptus woodland (0.4 acre), non-native vegetation (0.9 acre), and developed (5.5 acres). In addition, the property is located within the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul segment of the County of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea plan.

## **S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures That Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects**

The County of San Diego has determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The County has prepared an Initial Study to determine the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR. Based on the Initial Study, the environmental issue areas identified for study in the EIR are agriculture, air quality, biology, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, transportation and traffic, utilities, and service systems. During preparation of this EIR, it was determined that potential impacts on land use, hazards, agricultural resources, and air quality are less than significant. Table ES-1 provided at the end of this section, presents a summary of the environmental impacts of the proposed project, mitigation measures to reduce potential significant impacts of the proposed project, and the level of significance of each impact after mitigation. Refer to Table ES-1 for a summary of environmental effects of the proposed project found to be significant and the mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid those effects.

## **S.3 Areas of Controversy**

No areas of controversy have been identified for this project. Comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR are included in Appendix A of this EIR.

## **S.4 Issues To Be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body**

Issues to be resolved by the decision-making body include rejecting alternatives to the proposed project or approving one of the alternatives to the proposed project; rejecting or approving the proposed project; and approving proposed mitigation measures for the project and other environmental findings.

## **S.5 Project Alternatives**

Seven alternatives to the proposed project are identified and five alternatives are analyzed in detail in Section 5.0 of this EIR: the No Development Alternative, No Project Alternative, Existing Land Use Regulations Alternative, Residential Use Alternative, and the No Groundwater Alternative. A Commercial Use Alternative and a Golf Course Alternative were also considered and rejected. These alternatives were chosen with a focus on reducing or eliminating significant environmental impacts of the proposed project.

### **No Development Alternative**

The No Development Alternative assumes that the project site would not be developed with the proposed project. The 53 residential units (theoretical yield) allowed under the existing (18) Multiple Rural Use and (17) Estate Residential General Plan designations would not be constructed. The project site would remain in its present condition and would continue to support the existing residential and agricultural uses. In addition, the site proposed for location of the joint Rural Fire Protection District (RFPD) and USFWS fire station would not be dedicated with the No Development Alternative. The fire station would instead be located on a leased parcel and would be financially responsible for construction of Peaceful Valley Road to Melody Road to provide access to the site. Without the proposed project, annexation into the SDCWA and MWD would not occur; however, the proposed fire station lot would be within the 28.85 acre portion of the site that is within the SDCWA, OWD, MWD, the OWD Improvement District Number 9, and the District water service would therefore be available. The RFPD would be financially responsible for extending the water line to the subject lot for service. The fire station improvement is a requirement of the Peaceful Valley Ranch project and would not occur if the proposed project is not implemented.

As such, the No Development Alternative would avoid or reduce most of the impacts associated with the proposed project. Hydrology and water quality impacts would be increased as no Best Management Practices (BMP's) would be implemented and no drainage improvements would occur. As this alternative would reduce or avoid all other impacts as compared to the proposed project, the No Development Alternative is considered to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, this alternative fails to meet any of the project objectives outlined in Chapter 1.0, such as the objective of reducing the risk of wildfire in the area, or providing resources to increase public safety and facilitate the efficient provision of fire protection services for the community of Jamul and the surrounding area and is therefore rejected. Refer to Section 5.2 for a detailed discussion of this alternative.

### **No Project Alternative**

The No Project Alternative proposes development of the project site as allowed under the current land use and zoning designations without special permitting. The No Project Alternative would result in single-family, rural residential development of the five legal lots established by the existing underlying parcel map. No additional development, such as the equestrian facilities, would be proposed. The eastern portion of the site would not be annexed into the SDCWA and the MWD, and would instead depend on groundwater, as annexation would be financially unjustifiable for the small number of lots proposed. This alternative would leave SC 760 in its currently adopted alignment. This alternative would reduce

impacts on traffic, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, land use, agricultural resources, groundwater resources, and air quality as compared to the project. In addition, this alternative would incrementally reduce potential air quality impacts as compared to the project, as a fewer number of vehicle trips would be generated by the reduced number of residential units. However, impacts on groundwater may potentially increase with this alternative, as public water service would not be provided to the five residential units and there would be no limitation on the continued use of groundwater for agricultural activities; however, this is not anticipated, given the historic groundwater use by the existing dwelling units. Additionally, land for the fire station would not be conveyed to the RFPD. The RFPD fire station would instead be located on a leased parcel of land on the subject property and the RFPD would be responsible for constructing Peaceful Valley Road onsite to Melody Road to provide access for the facilities. This would likely inhibit the District's ability to relocate on the subject property, thereby affecting the ability of the project to contribute to increased public safety and fire protection service capabilities for the Jamul community and the surrounding area. Water service for the fire station would be provided by the District, with the RFPD responsible for extension of the water line to the fire station lot. As this alternative fails to meet several of the project objectives outlined in Chapter 1.0, it is therefore rejected. Refer to Section 5.3 for a detailed discussion of this alternative.

### **Existing Land Use Regulations Alternative**

The Existing General Plan Alternative proposes a design that eliminates the public and private equestrian facilities and subdivides the property for residential development, consistent with the existing zoning designations that apply to the property. This alternative would result in 33 residential lots as allowed under the existing General Plan land use designations that apply to the property; refer to Table 1-1B. On the 28.85-acre portion of the property, existing zoning would allow 2-acre lots, resulting in approximately 14 dwelling units. On the 152.46-acre portion, the A72 (8) zone would allow for 8-acre lots, resulting in approximately 19 dwelling units. This alternative would not include development of the equestrian facilities; however, a parcel would still be reserved for construction of the fire station. The eastern portion of the property would be annexed into the SDCWA and MWD for water service and would therefore not be dependent on groundwater. This alternative would also leave SC 760 in its currently adopted alignment.

The Existing Land Use Regulations Alternative would reduce traffic and circulation impacts resulting from the proposed project, as fewer residential units would be constructed. Impacts on biological resources would also be similar as compared to the project, as the development footprint would be the same as for the proposed project, but potential impacts to off-site sensitive vegetation would be reduced. Impacts on groundwater resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project, as both developments would require annexation into the SDCWA and MWD for service, but this alternative would not propose the use of groundwater for irrigation purposes. Impacts to cultural resources, land use and air quality would also be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Impacts to land use, air quality, and utilities and service systems would also be reduced with this alternative as compared to the proposed project. However, this alternative is rejected because it fails to meet many of the project objectives, including developing an equestrian-oriented project that incorporates both public and private equestrian facilities for the Jamul community, achieving consistency with the rural community character of Jamul, or of proactively providing increased resources

for the community to fight wildfires (i.e. staging area). As this alternative would not meet several of the project objectives outlined in Chapter 1, it is therefore rejected. Refer to Section 5.4 for a detailed discussion of this alternative.

### **Residential Use Alternative**

The Residential Use Alternative proposes application of the (17) Estate land use designation over the entire property. This alternative would allow up to 90 two-acre-minimum residential lots. This alternative does not include development of the public/private equestrian facilities; however, reservation of a lot for relocation of the RFPD fire protection district would occur. The eastern portion of the property would be annexed into the SDCWA and MWD for water service and the residences would not be dependent upon groundwater use, similar to the proposed project. This alternative would delete the portion of the SC 760 alignment from Olive Vista Drive to SR-94 from the County's General Plan Circulation Element, similar to the proposed project.

The Residential Use Alternative would result in increased traffic impacts and incremental impacts on air quality as compared to the proposed project, as development would result in development of 43 more residential units than the proposed project. Impacts on groundwater would be reduced as compared to the proposed project, as the project would annex into the SDCWA and the MWD, but the use of groundwater for irrigation purposes would not be proposed. Impacts to noise, hazards, and hydrology and water quality would also be greater than those resulting from the proposed project. This alternative is rejected, as it fails to achieve several of the project objectives, including developing an equestrian-oriented project that incorporates both public and private equestrian facilities, or achieving consistency with the rural community character of Jamul. Refer to Section 5.5 for a detailed discussion regarding this alternative.

### **No Groundwater Alternative**

The No Groundwater Alternative proposes development of the project site as is proposed by the current project, with 46 new residential lots and all accompanying uses, such as the public and private equestrian uses. The eastern portion of the property would be annexed into the SDCWA and MWD for water service; however, this alternative does not propose the use of groundwater for irrigation of the polo field. Rather, this alternative relies on imported water for the irrigation of the polo field.

Overall, impacts would be the same or reduced for this alternative as for the proposed project, with the exception of groundwater use. Mitigation for the proposed project is provided to limit the use of groundwater to an annual amount not to exceed the annual amount of groundwater recharge generated by the project. By utilizing groundwater for the proposed project, the project is consistent with established *CWA Water Use Efficiency Guidelines* that apply to the project to reduce demand for imported water service. However, with this alternative, the reliance on imported water would be greater, thereby creating an inconsistency with the established CWA guidelines. As this alternative is the same as the proposed project, with the exception of groundwater use, it accomplishes the majority of the project objectives. Therefore, this alternative is not rejected. Refer to Section 5.6 for additional discussion regarding this alternative.

**THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY.**



**Table S-1**  
**Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation**

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
<b>PROJECT-LEVEL IMPACTS</b>		
<b>SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS</b>		
<b>Traffic and Circulation (Section 2.1)</b>		
<p><b>(Impacts 2.1.3-1, 2.1.3-2, and 2.1.3-3)</b>  The proposed project was found to have a significant and unavoidable direct impact on the following roadway segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR 94 from Jamacha Road to Steele Canyon Road;</li> <li>• SR 94 from Steele Canyon Road to Lyons Valley Road; and,</li> <li>• SR 94 from Lyons Valley Road to Melody Road.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Direct Impacts</b>  <i>Roadway Segments</i>  <b>2.1.3-1, 2.1.3-2 and 2.1.3-3:</b> To partially mitigate for the project's impacts on SR-94, and prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Make a fair-share contribution towards improvements at the SR-94/Jefferson Road intersection, as requested by Caltrans.</p> <p>The direct impacts to SR 94 cannot be fully mitigated without the widening of SR 94 between Jamacha Road and Melody Road from two lanes to four lanes. To partially mitigate for the project's impacts to SR 94, and prior to the issuance of any building permit or commencement of building construction in use in reliance of the Tentative Map, the applicant shall make a fair share contribution towards improvements at the SR 94/Jefferson Road intersection, as requested by Caltrans. However, project impacts on SR 94 would remain significant and not completely mitigated.</p> <p>The contribution towards improvements at the intersection of Jefferson Road/SR 94 is considered feasible mitigation because the improvements have already been approved by the County of San Diego. The County of San Diego has conditioned another development project in the area to complete improvements to the north leg of the Jefferson Road/SR 94 intersection by creating a dedicated right turn lane from southbound Jefferson Road to westbound SR 94. The County has approved the improvements but the required funding for the project does not cover the engineering and construction costs. To partially mitigate for impacts to SR 94, the Peaceful Valley Ranch project would contribute a fair share cost to the improvement of this intersection.</p> <p>The project shall widen the existing roadway shoulder by constructing an 8-foot wide paved shoulder, in combination with a 15-foot wide (minimum) graded shoulder, along the project's frontage onto SR-94. These improvements would improve site distance along this segment of roadway.</p>	<p><b>Significant and Not Mitigated.</b></p>

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
<p><b>(Impacts 2.1.3-4, 2.1.3-5, and 2.1.3-6)</b> The proposed project was found to have a significant and unavoidable direct impact on the following roadway segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR 94 from Jamacha Road to Steele Canyon Road;</li> <li>• SR 94 from Steele Canyon Road to Lyons Valley Road; and,</li> <li>• SR 94 from Lyons Valley Road to Melody Road</li> </ul>	<p><i>Roadway Segment Impacts Associated with the Deletion of SC 760</i></p> <p><b>2.1.3-4, 2.1.3-5 and 2.1.3-6:</b> Mitigation for these impacts is the same as for Impacts 2.1.3-1, 2.1.3-2 and 2.1.3-3.</p>	<p><b>Significant and Not Mitigated.</b></p>
<b>IMPACTS MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT</b>		
<b>Transportation and Circulation (Section 2.1)</b>		
<p><b>(Impact 2.1.3-7)</b> The project will have cumulatively considerable impacts on the following roadway segment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR-94 from Jamacha Road to Steele Canyon Road</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b></p> <p><i>Roadway Segments</i></p> <p><b>2.1.3-7</b> Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Contribute to the County Transportation Impact Fee Program for the project's impacts on SR-94. The amount shall be consistent with the County Code, as amended and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>
<p><b>(Impact 2.1.3-8)</b> The project will have cumulatively considerable impacts on the following roadway segment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR-94 from Steele Canyon Road to Lyons Valley Road</li> </ul>	<p><b>2.1.3-8</b> Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Contribute to the County Transportation Impact Fee Program for the project's impacts on SR-94. The amount shall be consistent with the County Code, as amended and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
<p><b>(Impact 2.1.3-9)</b> The project will have cumulatively considerable impacts on the following roadway segment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SR-94 from Lyons Valley Road to Melody Road</li> </ul>	<p><b>2.1.3-9</b> Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Contribute to the County Transportation Impact Fee Program for the project's impacts on SR-94. The amount shall be consistent with the County Code, as amended and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>
<p><b>(Impact 2.1.3-10)</b> The project will have cumulatively considerable impacts on the following intersection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SR 94/Lyons Valley Road</li> </ul>	<p><i>Intersections</i></p> <p><b>2.1.3-10</b> Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Contribute to the County Transportation Impact Fee Program for the project's contribution to impacts at the SR 94/Lyons Valley Road intersection. The amount shall be consistent with the County Code, as amended and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>
<p><b>(Impact 2.1.3-11)</b> The project will have cumulatively considerable impacts on the following intersection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SR 94/Melody Road</li> </ul>	<p><b>2.1.3-11</b> Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribute to the County's Transportation Impact Fee Program towards the future signalization of the SR 94/Melody Road intersection for project impacts to the intersection.</li> <li>Construct a dedicated southbound left-turn lane on SR 94 and two westbound approach lanes on Peaceful Valley Ranch Road to accommodate project traffic at the intersection, consistent with the conceptual striping plan for the SR 94/Melody Road intersection, contained in Appendix G of the Traffic Impact Analysis.</li> </ol> <p>NOTE: It should be noted that with project traffic, but without the Jamul Casino traffic, the intersection of SR-94/Melody Road is calculated to operate at LOS C during both the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, based only on traffic volumes, signalization would not be necessary if the Jamul Casino project was not constructed.</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
<p><b>(Impact 2.1.3-12)</b> The project will have cumulatively considerable impacts on the following intersection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SR 94/Steele Canyon Road</li> </ul>	<p><b>2.1.3-12:</b> Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Contribute to the County Transportation Impact Fee Program for the project's impact at the SR-94/Steele Canyon Road intersection. The amount shall be consistent with the County Code, as amended and adopted by the County Board of Supervisors.</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>
<b>Biological Resources (Section 3.1)</b>		
<p><b>(Impact 3.1.3-1)</b> Impacts to the following habitats are considered significant due to their limited distribution within the region: streambed, coast live oak woodland, riparian woodland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, and non-native grassland.</p>	<p><i>Sensitive Vegetation Communities</i></p> <p><b>3.1.3-1</b> Impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub, disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub, southern mixed chaparral, and non-native grassland shall be mitigated through offsite mitigation as follows.</p> <p>A minimum of 38.1 acres of upland habitats that includes 0.04 acre of coast live oak woodland mitigation for oak root zone buffer shall be acquired at a County-approved mitigation bank within the MSCP. Alternatively, the required habitat types and acreage could be preserved and managed in permanent biological open space in a county-approved location in accordance with a County-approved Habitat Management Plan. Any offsite habitat mitigation must be within the MSCP in an area designated as a Pre-approved Mitigation Area (PAMA) or meeting the definition of a BRCA.</p> <p>Although impacts to sensitive plant species are considered less than significant, in accordance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), impacts to Group D plant species shall be protected through the habitat-based mitigation as detailed in mitigation measure 3.1.3-1.</p>	<p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b></p>
<p><b>(Impact 3.1.3-2)</b> Impacts to the sensitive avian species that may breed on site (Cooper's hawk, Bell's sage sparrow, northern harrier, California horned lark, loggerhead shrike, and red-shouldered hawk) are considered significant.</p>	<p><i>Sensitive Animal Species</i></p> <p><b>3.1.3-2</b> In order to ensure compliance with the MBTA, clearing of native vegetation shall occur outside of the breeding season of most avian species (February 15 through September 15). Clearing during the breeding season of MBTA-covered species could occur if it is determined that no nesting birds (or birds displaying breeding or nesting behavior) are present immediately prior to clearing and would require approval of the Director of Planning and Land Use through written concurrence from the USFWS and CDFG that no breeding or nesting avian species are present in the vicinity of the grubbing, grading, and construction.</p>	<p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b></p>

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
<b>(Impact 3.1.3-3)</b> Impacts to non-wetland Waters of the U.S. under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) are considered significant.	<p><i>Jurisdictional Areas</i></p> <p><b>3.1.3-3</b> Impacts to 0.32 acre of ACOE and CDFG jurisdiction shall be mitigated by purchase of credits worth 0.32 acre at the Rancho Jamul Mitigation Bank or other bank approved by the Director of Planning and Land Use.</p>	<b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>
<b>(Impact 3.1.3-4)</b> Disturbance to raptor habitat caused by grubbing, grading, or construction is considered to be significant.	<p><i>Construction Noise</i></p> <p><b>3.1.3-4:</b> Impacts relating to construction noise shall be mitigated by causing to be placed on grading and/or improvement plans and on the Final Map, the following: Restrict all brushing, clearing and/or grading such that none will be allowed within 300 feet of occupied tree-nesting raptor habitat or 800 feet within ground-nesting raptor habitat during the breeding season This is defined as occurring between February 15 through July 15. The Director of Planning and Land Use may waive this condition, through written concurrence from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game, that no raptors are present in the vicinity of the brushing, clearing or grading.</p>	<b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>
<b>(Impact 3.1.3-5)</b> Disturbance to native or non-native plant species resulting from ground disturbance during grading or construction is considered to be significant.	<p><i>Non-Native Plant Species</i></p> <p>Areas that are impacted but undeveloped (e.g., cut or fill slopes) shall be revegetated with native species or non-invasive non-native species immediately after ground disturbance is completed.</p>	<b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>
<b>(Impact 3.1.3-6)</b> The introduction of nuisance or domesticated animal species into open space would be significant.	<p><i>Domesticated Pets</i></p> <p><b>3.1.3-6</b> Potential impacts of pets and nuisance animal species on wildlife shall be mitigated through informational signage and permanent fencing.</p>	<b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
<b>(Impact 3.1.3-7)</b> Impacts to sensitive vegetation from increases in human activity in the area would be significant.	<p><i>Human Activity</i></p> <p><b>3.1.3-7</b> Permanent fencing and signage shall be provided identifying the limits of all onsite biological open space, consistent with Figure 3.1-7 of the EIR and more particularly described on TM 5341 RPL5. In addition, permanent fencing will be provided along sides of all trails adjacent to biological open space. In addition, preserved habitat shall be posted with signs precluding access due to habitat sensitivity and prohibiting dumping.</p>	<b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>
<b>(Impact 3.1.3-8)</b> Impacts from construction outside the limits of the proposed project would be significant.	<p><i>Errant Construction</i></p> <p><b>3.1.3.8</b> Early temporary fencing shall be required where proposed grubbing, clearing, or grading is within 100 feet of biological open space. All construction limits shall be clearly delineated with temporary fencing, such as silt fencing or fiber rolls and orange construction fencing to ensure that construction activity remains within the defined limits evaluated in the Biological Technical Report. A qualified biologist shall inspect the fencing and shall monitor construction activities occurring adjacent to the construction limits to avoid unauthorized impacts. The project proponent shall provide evidence to the Department of Planning and Land Use in the form of a letter that the biologist has been contracted, has completed the monitoring, and that requirements have been met successfully.</p>	<b>Less than Significant Impact</b>
<b>(Impact 3.1.3-9)</b> Impacts from groundwater drawdown exceeding three feet below the historic groundwater elevation table would be significant.	<p><i>Groundwater Drawdown</i></p> <p><b>3.1.3-9</b> The project will implement monitoring and mitigation requirements consistent with the Groundwater Resource Evaluation report (Wiedlin &amp; Associates 2006).</p>	<b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>

Table S-1 continued

<u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>CONCLUSION</u>
<b>Noise (Section 3.2)</b>		
<p><b>(Impact 3.2.3-1)</b> Noise impacts to noise-sensitive land uses as a result of traffic noise are significant.</p>	<p><i>Project Operations – Onsite Traffic Noise</i></p> <p><b>3.2.3-1</b> On the final map the applicant shall:</p> <p>Grant to the County of San Diego a Noise Protection Easement over the entire area of Lots 1, 48, and 49 of Tentative Map TM 5341 RPL5. This easement is for the mitigation of present and anticipated future excess noise levels on noise-sensitive land use of the affected Lots. The easement shall require:</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of any building permit for any residential use within the noise protection easement, the applicant shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Complete to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use, a site-specific acoustical analysis performed by a County certified acoustical engineer, demonstrating that the present and anticipated future noise levels for the interior noise sensitive Areas and exterior noise sensitive areas (useable areas) of residential dwelling will not exceed the allowable sound level limit of the Noise Element of the San Diego County General Plan [ interior (45 dBA CNEL), exterior ( 60 dBA CNEL)]. Future traffic noise level estimates for Campo Road (SR-94), must utilize a Level of Service “C” traffic flow for a major road classification which is designated General Plan Circulation Element Buildout roadway classification south of Melody Road.</li> <li>2) Incorporate to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use all the recommendations or mitigation measures of the acoustical analysis into the project design and building plans.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>

Table S-1 continued

<u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>CONCLUSION</u>
<b>Cultural Resources (Section 3.3)</b>		
<p><b>(Impact 3.3.3-1)</b> Impacts to cultural resources resulting from encroachment into the open space easement area, and on Site SDI-11,050 Locus A, by people and horses using the proposed equestrian facility would be considered significant.</p>	<p><b>Archaeological Site Capping Plan</b></p> <p><b>3.3.3-1a:</b> Prior to approval of grading permits or improvement plans, or on the Final Map, whichever comes first, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Implement an archaeological site capping plan for the protection of site CA-SDI-11,050 Locus A to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use. Implementation of the capping plan shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to placing the cap, a letter shall be submitted to the Director of Planning and Land Use stating that a County certified-archaeologist has been retained to supervise and monitor the capping of the archaeological site.</li> <li>• Capping of the archaeological site shall be conducted by first placing construction fabric (e.g. Amoco) or a minimum of six inches of sterile sand over the entire area of the archaeological site to be capped. The sand layer shall be covered with 1.5 to 2.0 feet of clean fill dirt. This layer shall be “feathered” out to ten feet beyond the defined boundary of the capping area to create a buffer. The materials to be used for capping shall be stockpiled and spread by hand.</li> <li>• After capping, the soil layer shall be landscaped with drought-resistant, non-native grasses. The species shall be selected in consultation with a landscape architect. Temporary irrigation, if necessary, shall be an above-ground system and shall be removed as soon as the vegetation has been established.</li> <li>• After the cap has been completed and the landscaping installed, the archaeologist shall prepare a final letter report that details how the capping procedure and landscaping were completed.</li> <li>• After capping all of the following activities are prohibited from taking place on the capped archaeological site: grading; excavation; placement of soil, sand, rock, gravel, or other material; clearing of vegetation; construction, erection, or placement of any building or structure; vehicular activities; trash dumping; or use for any purpose other than open space.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>



Table S-1 continued

<u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>CONCLUSION</u>
	<p>The sole exception(s) to this prohibition is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planting of non-native grasses, irrigation lines, or utility lines in the sterile cap above the archaeological deposits shall be permitted according to a plan approved by the Director of Planning and Land Use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Curation</b></p> <p><b>3.3.3-1b:</b> All artifacts obtained during the field survey and significance testing phases of the cultural study shall be curated to exhaust the information potential associated with each site to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use. The curation program shall be implemented as follows:</p> <p>Prior to approval of grading permits or improvement plans, or prior to the recordation of the Final Map, whichever comes first, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use that all archaeological materials recovered during the Brian F. Smith archaeological investigations of the property (2006), including all significance testing as well as grading monitoring activities, have been curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>Enter into a Secured Agreement with the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use, secured by a letter of credit, bond, or cash for 150 percent of the estimated costs associated with the curation of archaeological materials recovered during both the significance testing and data recovery phases, and a 10 percent cash deposit not to exceed \$30,000. A cost estimate shall be submitted and approved by the Director of Planning and Land Use for the cost of curation that includes the processing of the archaeological material by the curation facility, and the archiving of</p>	

Table S-1 continued

<u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>CONCLUSION</u>
	<p>the archaeological material in perpetuity.</p> <p><b>Temporary Fencing</b></p> <p><b>3.3.3-1c:</b> A temporary fencing plan for the protection of site CA-SDI-11,050 Locus A during grading operations shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use. Implementation of the temporary fencing plan shall include the following:</p> <p>Prior to approval of grading permits or improvement plans, or on the Final Map, whichever comes first, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Prepare and implement a temporary fencing plan for the protection of archaeological site CA-SDI-11,050, Locus A, during any grading activities within one hundred feet (100') of easement "C", as shown on Tentative Map 5341Rpl5 dated November 2006. The temporary fencing plan shall be prepared in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, and submitted to the Director of Planning and Land Use for approval. The fenced area shall include a buffer sufficient to protect the archaeological site. The fence shall be installed under the supervision of the qualified archaeologist prior to commencement of grading or brushing and be removed only after grading operations have been completed.</p> <p>A. Provide Evidence to the Director of Planning and Land Use that the following notes have been placed on the Grading Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the event that construction activities are to take place within 100 feet of easement "C", as shown on Tentative Map 5341Rpl5 dated November 2006, the temporary fencing plan shall be implemented under the supervision of a qualified archaeologist that consists of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identify site boundaries.</li> <li>b. Determine adequate buffer for the protection of the site in consultation with the County Archaeologist.</li> <li>c. Upon approval of buffers, install fencing.</li> <li>d. Submit to the Director of Planning and Land Use for approval, a signed and stamped statement from a California Registered Engineer, or licensed surveyor that temporary</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
	<p>fences have been installed in all locations of the project where proposed grading or clearing is within 100 feet of the easement "C".</p> <p>e. Fencing may be removed after the conclusion of construction activities.</p>	
<p><b>(Impact 3.3.3-2)</b> The proposed project would be required to mitigate for previous significant impacts from geological testing to cultural resources onsite.</p>	<p><b>Cultural Impact Fee</b></p> <p><b>3.3.3-2:</b> Prior to approval of grading permits or improvement plans, or prior to recordation of the Final Map, whichever comes first, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use that a payment of \$1,000.00 for the curation of orphan collections shall be made to the San Diego Archaeological Center for geological testing that has impacted site, CA-SDI-11,050, Locus A. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the San Diego Archaeological Center identifying that payment has been received.</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>
<p><b>(Impact 3.3.3-3)</b> The proposed project would be required to mitigate for significant impacts to undiscovered archaeological resources during grading activities.</p>	<p><b>Grading Monitoring and Data Recovery Program</b></p> <p><b>3.3.3-3a:</b> Prior to approval of grading or improvement plans, the subdivider shall:</p> <p>A. Implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the Peaceful Valley Project, TM5341RPL5/P04-048 to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. This program shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide written evidence to the Department of Planning and Land Use that a County certified archaeologist has been contracted to implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use (DPLU). A letter from the Project Archaeologist shall be submitted to the director of Director of Planning and Land Use. The letter shall include the following guidelines: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The consulting archaeologist shall contract with a Native American monitor to be involved with the grading monitoring program.</li> <li>b. The County certified archaeologist/historian and a Native American monitor shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p>

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. The consulting archaeologist shall monitor all areas identified for development.</li> <li>d. An adequate number of monitors (archaeological/historical/ Native American) shall be present to ensure that all earth moving activities area are observed and shall be onsite during all grading activities.</li> <li>e. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) and Native American monitor shall be onsite full-time to perform full-time monitoring as determined by the Principal Investigator of the excavations. The frequency of inspections will depend on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of the inspections will be determined by the Principal Investigator and the Native American monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Principal Investigator.</li> <li>f. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed.</li> <li>g. In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the archaeologist shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with the County staff archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods.</li> <li>h. If any human bones are discovered, the Principal Investigator shall contact the County Coroner. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely</li> </ul>	

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
	<p>Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The Principal Investigator shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate sample for analysis.</li> <li>j. In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program and all previous archaeological studies shall be processed and curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.</li> <li>k. In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, a report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms.</li> <li>l. In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of Planning and Land Use by the consulting archaeologist that the grading monitoring activities have been completed.</li> </ul> <p>B. Provide Evidence to the Director of Planning and Land Use that the following notes have been placed on the Grading Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The County-certified archaeologist/historian and Native American</li> </ul>	

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
	<p>monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) and Native American monitor(s) shall be onsite full-time to perform full-time monitoring as determined by the Principal Investigator of the excavations. The frequency of inspections will depend on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of the inspections will be determined by the Principal Investigator and the Native American monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Principal Investigator.</li> <li>3. In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the archaeological monitors shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The Principal Investigator shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery. The Principal Investigator, in consultation with the County staff archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the Principal Investigator and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods.</li> <li>4. The consulting archaeologist shall monitor all areas identified for development.</li> <li>5. If any human bones are discovered, the Principal Investigator shall contact the County Coroner. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.</li> <li>6. Prior to rough grading inspection sign-off, provide evidence that the field</li> </ol>	

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
	<p>grading monitoring activities have been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Principal Investigator.</p> <p>7. Prior to Final Grading Release, submit to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use, a final report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program. The report shall also include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms.</li> <li>b. Evidence that all cultural materials collected during the grading monitoring program has been curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriated curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.</li> </ul> <p>In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of Planning and Land Use by the Principal Investigator that the grading monitoring activities have been completed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>Enter into a Secured Agreement with the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use, secured by a letter of credit, bond, or cash for 150 percent of the estimated costs associated with the preparation of the Final Report that document the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program, and a 10 Percent cash deposit not to exceed \$30,000. A cost estimate shall be submitted and approved by the Director of Planning and Land Use for the cost of preparing the Final Grading Monitoring that includes artifact analysis, and specialized</p>	

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
	<p>studies such as lithics analysis, ceramics analysis, faunal analysis, floral analysis, assemblage analysis, and radiocarbon dating as determined by the Principal Investigator in consultation with County Staff Archaeologist.</p> <p>C. Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complete and submit a final report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use. The report shall also include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site Forms.</li> <li>b. Evidence that all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program has been curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.</li> </ol> <p>In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of Planning and Land Use by the Principal Investigator that the grading monitoring activities have been completed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>Enter into a Secured Agreement with the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use, secured by a letter of credit, bond, or cash for 150 percent of the estimated costs associated with the preparation of the Final Report that document the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program, and a 10 percent cash deposit not to exceed</p> </li> </ol>	



Table S-1 continued

<u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>CONCLUSION</u>
	\$30,000. A cost estimate shall be submitted and approved by the Director of Planning and Land Use for the cost of preparing the Final Grading Monitoring that includes artifact analysis, and specialized studies such as lithics analysis, ceramics analysis, faunal analysis, floral analysis, assemblage analysis, and radiocarbon dating as determined by the Principal Investigator in consultation with County Staff Archaeologist.	
<b>Groundwater Resources (Section 3.4)</b>		
<b>(Impact 3.4.3-1)</b> The proposed project would be required to mitigate for significant impacts to groundwater dependent habitat.	<p><b>3.4.3-1:</b> A groundwater level monitoring program shall be established, consistent with Appendix A of the <i>Groundwater Resource Evaluation</i> to tie groundwater production to groundwater drawdown at a monitoring well to be installed in the vicinity of the nearest groundwater dependent habitat. The owner of Lot 51 shall retain a hydrogeologist, certified by the State of California, to direct the groundwater monitoring program. The nearest groundwater dependent habitat, a solitary sycamore tree, is approximately 215 feet southwest of well PV-4, and downgradient from the well. A proposed monitoring well, PV-6, will be installed between the sycamore tree and the pumping well. The proposed monitor well shall be located on the opposite, or east, side of the creek bed from the sycamore tree at the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area. The Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area is managed by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Accordingly, the proposed well location shall be contingent on CDFG's authorization, timely response, and reasonable access and liability requirements.</p> <p>Proposed monitoring well PV-6 shall be completed to a depth approximately 10 feet below the groundwater threshold; a depth of approximately 45 feet. The well may need to be completed using a combination of air rotary drilling and hollow stem auger methods. The well shall be completed to the standards defined in the San Diego County SAM Manual.</p> <p>These specific actions are further defined in the groundwater monitoring and mitigation plan as defined in Appendix A of the <i>Groundwater Resource Evaluation</i> and include, but are not limited to the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install a cumulative flow meter at well PV-4 and record water usage monthly.</li> </ul>	<b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>

Table S-1 continued

<u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u>	<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>	<u>CONCLUSION</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measure water levels at wells PV-2, PV-4, and the proposed well PV-6 every month.</li> <li>• Prepare and submit to DPLU an annual groundwater monitoring report within 28 calendar days after the end of the annual monitoring period.</li> <li>• The annual monitoring report shall include groundwater production and groundwater level data and shall document shutdowns in groundwater production induced by groundwater levels dropping below the biological groundwater threshold. The report shall also evaluate whether groundwater production was in compliance with the restriction that production will not exceed development-induced groundwater recharge as calculated using the method summarized in Table 6 of the groundwater report. The report shall include an estimate of project development-induced groundwater recharge based on an inventory of what parcels have been developed and are using OWD water.</li> </ul>	
<b>Hazards And Hazardous Materials (Section 3.5)</b>		
<b>(Impact 3.5.3-1)</b> The proposed project would be required to mitigate for significant impacts resulting from the (undiscovered) onsite UST.	<p><b>Potential UST in Area 3</b></p> <p><b>3.5.3-1:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall:</p> <p>xcavate the area under the maintenance/workshop building for evidence of an underground storage tank (UST). If a UST is found, the UST shall be removed under permit and inspection of the DEH Underground Storage Tank Program.</p> <p>The DEH removal process adequately mitigates potential impacts because the DEH requires soil samples to be taken as part of a UST removal to determine if contamination exists and requires remediation of contaminated soils if necessary. All UST removal will be completed in accordance with the requirements of the DEH site Assessment and Mitigation Program Manual.</p>	<b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>

Table S-1 continued

<b><u>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</u></b>	<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>
<p><b>(Impact 3.5.3-2)</b> The proposed project would be required to mitigate for significant impacts resulting from soil existing staining in Area 1.</p>	<p><b><i>Stained Soil Area in Area 1</i></b></p> <p><b>3.5.3-2</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Prepare and execute a plan to remediate the area of stained soils in Areas A and B (within Area 1) to the satisfaction of the DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation Program. Remediation will generally include excavation of soils in Area A to a depth of approximately two feet below ground surface and excavation of an approximate six by seven foot area to the bottom of visible staining in Area B. Excavated soils would be placed in containers for characterization and offsite disposal in accordance with applicable regulations.</p>	<p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b></p>
<p><b>(Impact 3.5.3-3)</b> The proposed project would be required to mitigate for significant impacts resulting from soil existing staining in Area 3.</p>	<p><b><i>Stained Soil Area in Area 3</i></b></p> <p><b>3.5.3-3</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall:</p> <p>Prepare and execute a plan to remediate the area of stained soils in Area 3 to the satisfaction of the DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation Program. Remediation will generally include excavation of an approximate six feet by six feet area of soils to a depth of approximately three feet. Excavated soils would be placed in containers for characterization and offsite disposal in accordance with applicable regulations. A confirmatory sample of the excavated soil shall be collected from the bottom of the excavation and shall be analyzed for lead and TPH.</p>	<p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b></p>

**Table S-1 continued**

**THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY**